DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 974 24 HE 000 768

By-Frey, James F.

Report of a Study to Determine the Feasibility of Establishing a Central Foreign Credential Evaluation Service Under Non-Governmental Auspices.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-9-8010
Pub Date Feb 69
Note-75p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.85
Descriptors-*Achievement Rating, Certification, Credentials, Educational Background, *Evaluation Needs, *Foreign Students, Grades (Scholastic), *Higher Education, Information Needs, *Student Records

The study was conducted to determine whether a non-governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service (FCES) should be established and if so, what services it would provide, what the demand for these services would be, and what financial resources it would require. A survey of admissions officers at 223 educational institutions and representatives of 38 agencies (federal government, private, and state teacher certification and nursing licensing boards) revealed that there is a continuing need for a central agency to evaluate credentials of foreign students and professionals. The evaluative reports provided by the FCES of the US Office of Education are authoritative and up-to-date, but are considered as somewhat general in nature. If this Service were to be discontinued, it was felt that a new independent agency should replace it. The new FCES would speed up the delivery of more detailed reports which would include: number of a student's years of formal education, quality of academic work in terms of his country's rating system and of the US grading scale, number of credit hours in major field and in all subjects, US equivalence for foreign certificates and degrees, and other items. No consensus was reached on the organizational structure of a new FCES but outside funds would be needed for its first 5 years, after which it would be entirely self-supporting. The report contains recommendations on staffing, budget, fees and billing arrangements, and 56 illustrative tables. (WM)

EDO 26974

BR9-8010
PA-24
OE-BR

REPORT

OF A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A CENTRAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE UNDER NON-GOVERNMENTAL AUSPICES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR-9-8010
PA 24
OE-BR

REPORT

OF A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A CENTRAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE UNDER NON-GOVERNMENTAL AUSPICES

James S. Frey
February, 1969

Sponsored by the
National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions

ABSTRACT

This feasibility study was conducted to determine whether a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service (FCES) could be established which would serve both academic institutions and governmental and private agencies and, if so, whether it could become self-supporting. The study concludes that the responses to both questions are affirmative.

Information for this study was collected from a representative sample of foreign student admissions officers and agency representatives. There was a strong consensus that a foreign credential evaluation service is needed, that it could be operated under non-govermental auspices, that it ought to provide more types of information than are currently being provided by the FCES of the U.S. Office of Education, and that the academic institutions and agencies which would use such an expanded service would be willing to pay for it if the quality of the service were good. Most of the respondents indicated that they would probably absorb the cost of such a service within their own budgets and not pass it on to their applicants.

There was a further consensus that if a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service is established, it should be sufficiently budgeted and staffed so that its evaluations are speedy, comprehensive, qualitative, and up-to-date; that its staff must be knowledgeable in the field of foreign credential evaluation; that the staff members should make constant use of all available sources of relevant information; and that they should share the information which they collect with other persons who work in this field.

The study concludes that it would most probably take about five years for a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service to be organized and fully developed. Funds obtained from membership and user fees would not be sufficient to support it during this period. It would therefore be necessary for such a service to receive a guarantee of financial assistance from some outside source, possibly on a declining scale of support as an increasing volume of use produces increased income. Such a guarantee would total approximately $765,000 for the five-year developmental period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
PART I.	GENERAL INFORMATION	
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Background	2
III.	Preparation For The Study	5
IV.	Description Of The Sample	7
PART II.	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OBTAINED FROM ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS	
V.	Description Of The Enrollments Of The Responding Institutions	9
VI.	Description Of The Evaluation Procedures Followed By The Responding Admissions Officers	13
VII.	Information Which The Responding Admissions Officers Feel A Foreign Credential Evaluation Service Should Provide	24
VIII.	Estimated Use By The Responding Admissions Officers Of A Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service	25
IX.	Fee Arrangements Preferred By The Responding Admisssions Officers	26
PART III.	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OBTAINED FROM AGENCIES	
X.	Description Of The Foreign Student Involvements Of The Responding Agencies	28
XI.	Description Of The Evaluation Procedures Followed By The Responding Agencies	30
XII.	Information Which The Responding Agencies Feel A Foreign Credential Evaluation Service Should Provide	37
XIII.	Estimated Use By The Responding Agencies Of A Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service	38
XIV.	Fee Arrangements Preferred By The Responding Agencies	40
PART IV.	SUMMARY	
XV.	Feasibility Of Establishing A Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service	42
XVI.	Information Which Should Be Provided By A Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service	45

Table Of Contents Continued

PART IV. SUMMARY (Continued)

XVII. Estimate Of The Volume Of Use Which A Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service Might Anticipate 50

PART V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

XVIII. Conclusions 54

XIX. Recommendations Concerning The Staffing of a Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service 56

XX. Recommendations Concerning Fees And Billing Arrangements 58

XXI. An Estimate Of The Budget Which Would Be Required By A Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service 60

XXII. Recommendations For A Five-Year Developmental Budget For A Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service 61

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
PART I.	GENERAL INFORMATION	
1.	Responses Received From Academic Institutions, By Type Of Institution	8
2.	Responses Received From Agencies, By Type Of Agency	8
PART II.	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OBTAINED FROM ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS	
3.	Total Enrollments Of The Responding Institutions	8
4.	Foreign Student Enrollments Of The Responding Institutions	10
5.	Number Of Countries Represented In Their Foreign Student Enrollments	11
6.	Number Of New Foreign Students Enrolled Each Year	11
7.	Number Of Foreign Student Applications Processed Each Year	11
8.	Basic Admissions Policy As Applied To Foreign Students	12
9.	Level Of Applications For Which The Responding Admissions Officers Are Responsible	14
10.	Determination Of Four Clues To The Quantity Of Education Which A Student Has Completed	14
11.	Determination Of Five Clues To The Quality Of Education Which A Student Has Completed	15
12.	Relative Importance Assigned To Three Quality Clues	15
13.	Methods Used To Determine And Express A Student's Overall Grade Average	15
14.	Rank-In-Class	16-17
15.	Major Resources Consulted For Clues In Order To Differentiate Between The Quality Of Institutions Within A Given Country And Between The Quality Of The Educational Systems Of Different Countries	17
16.	Requests For Assistance Directed To Persons Outside Of The Foreign Student Admissions Office	19
17.	Resource Personnel At The Admissions Officer's Own Institution	19

List Of Tables(Continued)

18.	Frequency of Requests For Assistance Directed To Admissions Officers Employed At Other Institutions	20
19.	Application Of Selective Admissions Policies In Three Different Qualitative Circumstances	20
20.	Existence Of Follow-Up Procedures	20
21.	Institutions Which Use The Services Of Outside Agencies	20
22.	Outside Agencies Which Are Used	21
23.	Frequency Of Use Of Outside Agencies	21
24.	Percentage Of Use Of Outside Agencies	21
25.	Institutions Which Have Used The FCES During The Past Calendar Year	22
26.	Frequency Of Use Of The FCES During The Past Calendar Year	23
27.	Use Of Information Obtained From Evaluation Services	23
28.	Positive Features Of The FCES	23
29.	Negative Features Of The FCES	24
30.	Information Which A Foreign Credential Evaluation Service Should Provide	24
31.	Estimated Use By The Responding Admissions Officers Of A Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service	26
32.	Preferred Fee Arrangement	27
33.	Preferred Billing Arrangement	27
34.	Probable Source Of Funds	28

PART III. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OBTAINED FROM AGENCIES

35.	Total Number Of Sets Of Foreign Academic Credentials Evaluated By The Responding Agencies	29
36.	Number Of Countries Represented By The Foreign Academic Credentials Evaluated By The Agencies Each Year	29
37.	Level Of Credeutials Evaluated By Agencies	31
38.	Quantitative And Qualitative Areas Of Concern	31

List Of Tables(Continued)

39.	Concern For Four Clues To The Quantity Of Education Which An Applicant Has Completed	31
40.	Concern For Five Clues To The Quality Of Education Which An Applicant Has Completed	32
41.	Relative Importance Assigned To Three Quality Clues	32
42.	Major Resources Consulted For Quality Clues In Order To Differentiate Between The Quality Of Institutions Within A Given Country And Between The Quality Of The Educational Systems Of Different Countries	33
43.	Application Of Selective Approval Policies In Three Different Qualitative Circumstances	34
44.	Existence Of Follow-Up Procedures	34
45.	Distribution Of Agencies Which Make Their Own Evaluations Of Foreign Educational Credentials	34
46.	Distribution Of Agencies Which Refer Foreign Educational Credentials To Other Agencies For Evaluation	34
47.	Frequency Of Referrals To Other Agencies	36
48.	Outside Agencies Which Are Used	36
49.	Agencies Which Have Used The FCES During The Past Calendar Year	36
50.	Positive Features Of The FCES	37
51.	Negative Features Of The FCES	37
52.	Information Which A Foreign Credential Evaluation Service Should Provide	39
53.	Estimated Use By The Responding Agencies Of A Non-Governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service	39
54.	Preferred Fee Arrangement	41
55.	Preferred Billing Arrangement	41
56.	Probable Source Of Funds	41

APPENDICES

A.	Total Number of Institutions and Agencies Contacted, By State	64-65
B.	Responses Received, By State	66-67

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the feasibility of establishing under non-governmental auspices a central foreign credential evaluation service for colleges, universities, governmental and private agencies. The question of feasibility involves a determination and definition of what services might be required, what demand for such services might be expected, what income through payment of fees might be anticipated, and what organizational resources and relationships might be required in order to operate this type of service.

The need for this study developed out of the interest of the U.S. Office of Education (OE) in the possible establishment of a non-governmental and self-supporting organization which would meet those needs which have been met in the past by the Foreign Credential Evaluation Service (FCES). Affected educational organizations had expressed concern that elimination of the FCES might have serious adverse consequences for colleges and universities which are dependent upon the kind of assistance which is provided by the FCES. Particularly affected would be those institutions with lesser resources and modest foreign student enrollments which probably cannot be expected to develop the expertise required for competent evaluation of foreign academic credentials. Moreover, all of higher education in the U.S. would be losing a center of competence and knowledge, a center which, because of the breadth and diversity of its operations, can develop resources and an expertise beyond that of even our largest academic institutions. Those who are involved with international education have perceived that not only colleges and universities but also government agencies and private organizations are finding it increasingly necessary to make pertinent decisions and judgements about individuals who have been educated in other countries. It seemed evident, therefore, that some such service would still be needed, even if it is not to be continued under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education.

In the summer of 1967 the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), and the National Association For Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), with the approval of the U.S. Office of Education, arranged for a review of the FCES by Mr. Richard Dremuk, Assistant University Dean for Graduate and Foreign Admissions at the University of Illinois.

After reviewing Mr. Dremuk's report, the Commissioner of Education and his staff asked the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions (composed of AACRAO, CEEB, the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), the Institute of International Education (IIE), and NAFSA) to submit one or more proposals for establishing a central foreign credentials evaluation service under non-governmental auspices. These five organizations, whose members have professional competence in the area most directly concerned with foreign student admission, requested a grant to conduct a planning study for this purpose. The grant was awarded on September 26, 1968, and the study was conducted from October 1, 1968 through February 15, 1969.

II. BACKGROUND

Ever since the U.S. Office of Education was established in 1867, it has published information on education in other countries, both as part of the regular reports of the U.S. Commissioner of Education and in separate bulletins and circulars. The responsibility for keeping up to date on educational developments in other countries has been assigned to the Comparative Education Staff (formerly known as the Comparative Education Branch and the Comparative Research Branch). This Staff includes comparative education specialists and research assistants whose chief assignments are to collect data and research materials concerning the educational systems of the world, to publish research studies of various types, and to answer requests for specific information concerning the educational systems and academic institutions of other countries.

In addition to these responsibilities, the Comparative Education Staff also provides a Foreign (Academic) Credential Evaluation Service (FCES). A by-product of the Comparative Education Staff's research functions, the FCES was initiated in response to one request received in 1919. By 1960 it had grown to a volume of 5000 requests per year, by 1965 to 8500, by 1967 to 14,000. It is estimated by Comparative Education Staff personnel that the volume of requests received during fiscal 1969 will exceed 17,000 and may, in fact, reach 20,000. At the present time, the FCES absorbs approximately 65% of the annual man hours of the Comparative Education Staff.

The U.S. Office of Education has never requested a budget appropriation to support the Foreign Credential Evaluation Service. It has thus been supported solely by diversion of funds allocated to the regular research programs of the Comparative Education Staff. In the meantime, the Comparative Education Staff has also acquired other duties which are not directly related to keeping abreast of educational developments in other countries. As a result, for the past three years the Staff members have spent most of their time on the FCES and other projects, and have not conducted any research on the educational systems of other countries. The information which forms the basis for the FCES may therefore already be obsolete.

In 1963 the Commissioner of Education requested Education and World Affairs (EWA) to examine the international dimensions of the U.S. Office of Education. The study which was conducted focused on the role which the Office of Education should play in helping U.S. educational institutions to define and fulfill their international responsibilities. In its report to the Commissioner (submitted in the fall of 1964) EWA recommended that the Comparative Education Staff's research activities should be increased and strengthened, and that its Foreign Credential Evaluation Service should be curtailed and, if possible, eliminated.

Early in 1966, the U.S. Office of Education announced that the FCES would be curtailed, beginning July 1, 1966, and that it would be terminated completely by

July 1, 1968. A conference on "foreign credential interpretation and educational studies", called by the U.S. Office of Education, was held in Washington, D.C. (April 6-7, 1966), at which time representatives from several universities and colleges and educational organizations were informed of the decision to curtail the FCES.

In a memorandum to the Commissioner of Education, the conference participants supported the U.S. Office of Education's plans to increase its support of international educational programs, but they expressed their strong disagreement with its decision to terminate the FCES, because it would increase the difficulty of making sound evaluations of the admissions dossiers of foreign applicants. The Commissioner responded that, because of the expanding international activities of U.S. institutions and agencies, and because the federal government was then considering an expansion of its role in international education, the Office of Education would continue the FCES for the present time.

Both the U.S. Office of Education and the conference participants had indicated that they would cooperate in developing plans for an alternate service which might supplement or replace the Foreign Credential Evaluation Service. However, little was done during the following months, and in the spring of 1967 the U.S. Office of Education again announced that the FCES would be discontinued, possibly to be contracted by OE to a private agency.

In the summer of 1967, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), and the National Association For Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) obtained a grant from the U.S. Department of State through the NAFSA Field Service to analyze the work of the FCES, particularly in relation to its use by universities and colleges. This study was conducted from July 31 to August 18 by Mr. Richard Dremuk, Assistant University Dean for Graduate and Foreign Admissions at the University of Illinois. In his report of this study, Mr. Dremuk recommended that the FCES should be continued, with adequate staff and funding, whether administered within the U.S.

Office of Education or transferred to an outside agency.

During its meeting of March 7, 1968, the National Liaison Committee (composed of representatives of AACRAO, CEEB, the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), the Institute of International Education (IIE) and NAFSA) reviewed the Dremuk report and the plans of the U.S. Office of Education concerning the FCES. The Committee had been asked by the Commissioner of Education and his staff to submit one or more proposals for establishing a central foreign credential evaluation service under non-governmental auspices, and the committee members concluded that they should ask the U.S. Office of Education for financial assistance for the development of that type of alternative to the FCES. A formal proposal for a "study to determine the feasibility of establishing a central foreign credentials evaluation service under non-governmental auspices" was submitted on July 18, 1968 to Dr. Paul Reagan, Chief of the International Services and Research Staff of the Institute of International Services of the U.S. Office of Education. The proposal was approved on September 26, and Mr. James S. Frey, Director of Foreign Student Services at the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, was asked to direct the study.

Data for the study was collected from October 1 to December 21, 1968. The due date for the final report (originally January 15) was later extended to February 15, 1969 by Dr. Reagan.

III. PREPARATION FOR THE STUDY

As soon as the feasibility study proposal was approved, the Director met with the members of the National Liaison Committee to discuss the procedures which would be followed. It was concluded that the best method of collecting data would be to interview a representative sample of admissions officers and agency representatives in order to ascertain their responses to the three key questions of the study:

1. What kinds of information should a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service provide?

2. If a service were to be established which would provide those kinds of information, how often would they be likely to use it?
3. If they were to use the service the approximate number of times which they had estimated, how would they prefer to meet the expense?

Admissions officers at eight different institutions were asked to host a three-hour meeting of foreign student admissions officers from their respective areas. Invitation lists were compiled by means of the NAFSA Directory, AACRAO's Credit Given, IIE's Open Doors, and the recommendations of the eight hosts. A total of 373 admissions officers from the metropolitan areas of Boston, New York, Washington D.C., Atlanta, Miami, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and Seattle were invited. In addition, 47 other admissions officers who were attending previously scheduled conferences in Mount Pleasant (Michigan), Chicago, and San Juan (Puerto Rico) were also consulted.

Because the short amount of time available for the feasibility study restricted the Director to visits to a relatively small number of cities, permission was obtained from Mr. Albert S. Storm of the U.S. Office of Education's Bureau of Research to collect some of the data by means of a mailed questionnaire. In this manner 198 additional admissions officers in 36 states were contacted. Questionnaires were also sent by mail to 21 state teacher certification agencies and 20 state nursing licensing boards. Personal conferences were scheduled with the U.S. Department of Labor in Washington D.C. and with the Offices of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service in Washington D.C., Milwaukee, and Los Angeles. (An indication of the total number of institutions and agencies which were contacted in each state, both for the personal visits and via the questionnaire, can be found in appendix A).

Background information for the conferences and materials for the questionnaire were obtained from Dremuk's report, from the minutes of previous National Liaison Committee meetings, from suggestions made by National Liaison Committee members,

and from conferences with Richard Dremuk and the chairmen of the Midwest Evaluation Project.*

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

120 of the 420 academic institutions whichwere invited to participate in a conference responded, for a response rate of 28.6%. 5 of the 6 agencies contacted for a conference responded, a rate of 83.3%. 103 of the 198 institutions contacted via the questionnaire responded, for a rate of 52.0%, 18 of 21 teacher certification boards, a rate of 85.7%, and 15 of 20 nursing licensing boards, a rate of 75.0%. The 261 total respondents represented 223 academic institutions (36.0% of those contacted) and 38 agencies (80.8% of those contacted). (An indication of the distribution of responses received, by state, can be found in appendix B).

Of the 223 academic institutions which responded, 94 are universities (institutions which offer both undergraduate and graduate programs, usually through the doctorate), 83 are colleges (institutions which offer four years of undergraduate study, possibly with some limited graduate programs at the master's level), 35 are junior colleges (institutions which offer two-year undergraduate "transfer" programs plus programs of a technical/vocational nature), and 11 are other types of institutions (which offer specialized programs in such fields as art, engineering, English-as-a-second-language, paramedical studies, technology, and theology). 110 of the respondents are publicly supported, 113 are private. Table 1 indicates the distribution of respondents by type of institution.

*The Midwest Evaluation Project is a pilot project sponsored by the National Liaison Committee, through which experienced admissions officers at larger academic institutions in the midwest voluntarily evaluate foreign academic credentials for their colleagues from institutions which have less than 100 undergraduate foreign students

TABLE 1. RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

TYPE	PUBLIC			PRIVATE			TOTAL		
	CONF.	QUES.	TOTAL	CONF.	QUES.	TOTAL	CONF.	QUES.	TOTALS
Universities	33	22	55	27	12	39	60	34	94
Colleges	16	10	26	19	38	57	35	48	83
Jr. Colleges	16	8	25	2	9	11	18	17	35
Others	3	2	5	4	2	6	7	4	11
TOTALS	68	42	110	52	61	113	120	103	223

TABLE 2. RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM AGENCIES, BY TYPE OF AGENCY

FEDERAL	STATE TEACHERS CERT.	STATE NURSING LICENSING	PRIVATE	TOTAL
4	18	15	1	38

TABLE 3. TOTAL ENROLLMENTS OF THE RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

TYPE	1-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000-9999	10,000+	TOTALS
Universities	0	0	20	27	47	94
Colleges	4	23	39	8	9	83
Jr. College	6	6	17	1	5	35
Others	5	3	2	1	0	11
TOTALS	15	32	78	37	61	223

Of the 38 agencies which responded, 4 are agencies of the federal government (3 offices of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and 1 of the U.S. Department of Labor), 18 are state teacher certification boards, 15 are state nursing licensing agencies, and one is a private educational screening and placement agency. Data from all of the federal agencies and the one private agency were obtained via conferences; data from all of the state agencies were obtained via the questionnaire. Table 2 summarizes the distribution of respondents by type of agency.

PART II. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OBTAINED FROM ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE ENROLLMENTS OF THE RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Of the 223 academic institutions which responded, 15 have total enrollments of fewer than 500 students; 32 have 500-999, 78 have 1000-4999, 37 have 5000-9999, and 61 have more than 10,000 students. Table 3 indicates the distribution of responding institutions, by total enrollment.

95 of the academic institutions which responded have total foreign student enrollments of fewer than 50 students; 33 have 50-99, 31 have 100-199, 11 have 200-299, 12 have 300-499, 11 have 500-999, and 15 have more than 1000 foreign students. Table 4 indicates the distribution of responding institutions, by foreign student enrollment.

60 of the academic institutions which responded have foreign students from fewer than 10 countries; 67 have students from 10-24 countries, 52 from 25-49 countries, 18 from 50-74 countries, 11 from 75-99 countries, and 7 from more than 100 countries. Table 5 indicates the distribution of responding institutions, by number of countries represented in their foreign student enrollments.

TABLE 4. FOREIGN STUDENT ENROLLMENTS OF THE RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

A: UNDERGRADUATE

TYPE	1-49	50-99	100-199	200-299	300-499	500-999	1000+	TOTALS*
Universities	33	19	8	7	3	5	4	79
Colleges	60	10	6	1	1	0	0	78
Jr. Colleges	26	5	2	0	1	0	1	35
Others	5	3	2	0	0	1	0	11
TOTALS	124	37	18	8	5	6	5	203

B: GRADUATE

TYPE	1-49	50-99	100-199	200-299	300-499	500-999	1000+	TOTALS*
Universities	27	14	12	4	1	6	8	72
Colleges	25	2	2	0	0	0	0	29
Jr. Colleges	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Others	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
TOTALS	56	16	14	4	1	6	8	105

C: TOTAL

TYPE	1-49	50-99	100-199	200-299	300-499	500-999	1000+	TOTALS*
Universities	13	14	17	9	9	10	14	86
Colleges	52	12	9	1	2	0	0	76
Jr. Colleges	25	4	4	0	1	0	1	35
Others	5	3	1	1	0	1	0	11
TOTALS	95	33	31	11	12	11	15	208

*Some of the responding admissions officers were unable to report complete information. E.g., some of those who have responsibility for undergraduate admission only were unable to furnish information concerning the graduate students enrolled at their institutions.

TABLE 5. NUMBER OF COUNTRIES REPRESENTED IN THEIR FOREIGN STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

TYPE	1-9	10-24	25-49	50-74	75-99	100+	TOTALS*
Universities	2	22	32	17	11	6	90
Colleges	31	37	11	0	0	1	80
Jr. Colleges	24	5	5	0	0	0	34
Others	3	3	4	1	0	0	11
TOTALS	60	67	52	18	11	7	215

TABLE 6. NUMBER OF NEW FOREIGN STUDENTS ENROLLED EACH YEAR

TYPE	1-24	25-49	50-99	100-199	200-299	300-499	500-749	750+	TOTALS*
Universities	23	12	22	9	3	7	5	1	82
Colleges	68	3	5	3	1	0	0	0	80
Jr. Colleges	25	3	2	0	2	0	0	1	33
Others	3	4	1	1	1	1	0	0	11
TOTALS	119	22	30	13	7	8	5	2	206

TABLE 7. NUMBER OF FOREIGN STUDENT APPLICATIONS PROCESSED EACH YEAR

TYPE	1-49	50-99	100-199	200-299	300-499	500-999	1000+	TOTALS*
Universities	9	14	11	12	7	11	21	85
Colleges	51	11	7	3	7	2	0	81
Jr. Colleges	23	3	2	1	3	1	1	34
Others	4	4	0	2	1	0	0	11
TOTALS	87	32	20	18	18	14	22	211

*Some admissions officers were not able to furnish this information.

119 of the 223 academic institutions which responded enroll fewer than 25 new foreign students each calendar year; 22 enroll 25-49 new foreign students, 30 enroll 50-99, 13 enroll 100-199, 7 enroll 200-299, 8 enroll 300-499, 5 enroll 500-749, and 2 enroll more than 750. Table 6 indicates the distribution of responding institutions, by number of new foreign students enrolled each year.

87 of the academic institutions which responded process fewer than 50 foreign student applications each calendar year; 32 process 50-99, 20 process 100-199, 18 process 200-299, 18 process 300-499, 14 process 500-999, and 22 process more than 1000. Table 7 indicates the distribution of responding institutions, by number of foreign student applications processed each year. (For the purposes of this study, a "foreign student application" was defined as an admissions dossier which is completed through the point where academic credentials are evaluated. Thus inquiries and incomplete applications which are cancelled or otherwise inactivated before academic credentials are evaluated were excluded from the data which was collected for this study).

77 admissions officers reported that their institutions encourage the admission of foreign students, 24 said that they discourage foreign applicants, and 122 reported that applications for admission submitted by foreign students are just processed routinely. Table 8 indicates the distribution of institutions according to these three basic admissions policies.

TABLE 8. BASIC ADMISSIONS POLICY AS APPLIED TO FOREIGN STUDENTS

TYPE	ENCOURAGE	PROCESS ROUTINELY	DISCOURAGE
Universities	34	50	10
Colleges	30	47	6
Jr. Colleges	9	19	7
Others	4	6	1
TOTALS	77	122	24

VI. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOLLOWED BY THE RESPONDING ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

Of the 223 admissions officers who responded, 137 are responsible for the admission of undergraduate foreign students only, 25 are responsible for the admission of graduate foreign students only, and 61 are responsible for both. Table 9 indicates the distribution of responding admissions officers, by level of responsibility.

When evaluating the quantity of education represented by foreign academic credentials, 202 of the 223 admissions officers who responded try to determine the total number of years of formal education which a student has completed. 184 try to determine the approximate equivalence of a student's certificates and diplomas to U.S. degrees (such as our A.A., B.A., M.A., Ph.D.). 125 try to determine the approximate number of credit hours which a student has completed in his major field, and 133 try to determine the approximate number of credit hours which a student has completed in all subjects studied thus far. Table 10 indicates the distribution of institutions by determination of these four clues to the quantity of education which a student has completed.

When evaluating the quality of education represented by foreign academic credentials, 200 of the 223 admissions officers who responded try to determine a student's overall grade average (gpa). 120 try to determine a student's grade average in his major field. 133 try to obtain a student's rank-in-class. 177 try to determine the academic reputation of the institution(s) which a student has attended, and 159 try to determine the academic reputation of the educational system of a student's country. Table 11 indicates the distribution of institutions by determination of these five clues to the quality of education which a student has completed.

Of the admissions officers who responded, 72 place relatively more emphasis on the quality of a student's overall grade average, 22 place relatively more emphasis

on the quality of the institution(s) which he attended, 17 place relatively more emphasis on the quality of his country's educational system, and 103 tend to place equal emphasis on all three of these quality clues. Table 12 indicates the distribution of institutions by the relative importance assigned to these three quality clues.

TABLE 9. LEVEL OF APPLICATIONS FOR WHICH THE RESPONDING ADMISSIONS OFFICERS ARE RESPONSIBLE

TYPE	UNDERGRADUATE	GRADUATE	BOTH	TOTALS
Universities	34	20	40	94
Colleges	61	4	18	83
Jr. Colleges	35	--	--	35
Others	7	1	3	11
TOTALS	137	25	61	223

TABLE 10. DETERMINATION OF FOUR CLUES TO THE QUANTITY OF EDUCATION WHICH A STUDENT HAS COMPLETED

TYPE	NUMBER OF YEARS	DEGREE EQUIV.	CREDITS-MAJOR	CREDITS-TOTAL
Universities	86	88	58	55
Colleges	74	66	42	52
Jr. Colleges	31	22	16	19
Others	11	8	9	7
TOTALS	202	184	125	133

TABLE 11. DETERMINATION OF FIVE CLUES TO THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION WHICH A STUDENT HAS COMPLETED

TYPE	GPA	GPA-MAJOR	RANK-IN-CLASS	INSTITUTION	COUNTRY
Universities	89	63	66	83	71
Colleges	74	39	47	63	53
Jr. Colleges	28	11	15	20	25
Others	9	7	5	11	10
TOTALS	200	120	133	177	159

TABLE 12. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE ASSIGNED TO THREE QUALITY CLUES

TYPE	OVERALL GPA	QUALITY OF INSTITUTION	QUALITY OF SYSTEM	EQUAL EMPHASI
Universities	21	11	9	48
Colleges	34	6	4	35
Jr. Colleges	14	3	3	15
Others	3	2	1	5
TOTALS	72	22	17	103

TABLE 13. METHODS USED TO DETERMINE AND EXPRESS A STUDENT'S OVERALL GRADE AVERAGE

TYPE	DETERMINATION OF OVERALL GPA		EXPRESSION OF OVERALL GPA	
	GRADES WEIGHTED	ALL GRADES EQUAL	FOREIGN SCALE	U.S. SCALE
Universities	65	24	52	37
Colleges	36	38	40	33
Jr. Colleges	12	15	12	15
Others	8	1	4	5
TOTALS	121	78	108	90

In determining a student's overall grade average, 121 of the admissions officers who responded weight each grade according to the number of hours or credits which are indicated on the student's academic records, while 78 treat all grades as equal. 108 express a student's overall grade average in terms of the grading scale which is used by his institution or country, while 90 express it in terms of their own institution's grading scale (e.g., 3.0 or 4.0 or 5.0). Table 13 indicates the distribution of institutions by methods used to determine and express a student's overall grade average.

Of the 223 admissions officers who responded, 64 always request a foreign student's rank-in-class, 70 frequently do, 41 seldom do, and 48 never do. Three admissions officers always receive it, 100 frequently do, 111 seldom do, and 9 never do. Table 14 indicates the distribution of institutions in relation to requesting/receiving a foreign student's rank-in-class.

Table 15 indicates the major resources which the responding admissions officers consult when trying to differentiate between the quality of institutions within a given country and between the quality of the educational systems of different countries. They tend to rely primarily upon such resources as published reference works (e.g., AACRAO's World Education Series), their own past experience, and members of their own institution's faculty and staff.

TABLE 14. RANK-IN-CLASS

A. REQUESTED

TYPE	ALWAYS	FREQUENTLY	SELDOM	NEVER
Universities	21	44	14	16
Colleges	31	16	18	17
Jr. Colleges	9	8	6	12
Others	3	2	3	3
TOTALS	64	70	41	48

TABLE 14. RANK-IN-CLASS (Continued)

B. RECEIVED

TYPE	ALWAYS	FREQUENTLY	SELDOM	NEVER
Universities	1	49	43	1
Colleges	2	35	44	2
Jr. Colleges	0	12	19	4
Others	0	4	5	2
TOTALS	3	100	111	9

TABLE 15. MAJOR RESOURCES CONSULTED FOR CLUES IN ORDER TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN THE QUALITY OF INSTITUTIONS WITHIN A GIVEN COUNTRY AND BETWEEN THE QUALITY OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

RESOURCE	UNIVERSITIES	COLLEGES	JR. COLLEGES	OTHERS	TOTALS
Published Reference Works	55	46	11	5	117
Past Experience	67	24	6	6	103
Own Faculty & Staff	37	10	7	2	56
Other Foreign Student Admissions Officers	7	4	5	3	19
Foreign U's Bulletin	9	3	0	2	14
OE-FCES	4	2	1	1	8
Foreign U's Admissions Requirements	3	0	0	0	3
Foreign U's Age, Size, Location	3	0	0	0	3
Agency Interview Reports	1	0	0	0	1

In the overall process of evaluating foreign academic credentials, 188 of the 223 responding admissions officers (84.3%) call upon the assistance of persons at their own institutions (outside of their own office), while 35 (15.7%) do not. 159 (71.3%) call upon the assistance of persons who are employed in the admissions field at other institutions, 64 (28.7%) do not. Table 16 indicates the distribution

of institutions which request assistance from persons working in other offices. Table 17 indicates that teaching faculty, departmental chairmen, and academic deans are the resource personnel at the admissions officer's own institutions who are most frequently consulted. Table 18 indicates the number of requests for assistance which admissions officers direct to colleagues who are employed at other institutions.

Of those institutions which have a selective admissions policy, 64 tend to admit a student from a high quality institution (even) if his grade average is relatively low, 77 tend to admit a student from a relatively low quality institution if his grade average is relatively high, and 59 tend to admit a student from an institution whose academic reputation is unknown to them (even) if his grade average is (only) average. 117 institutions have developed some type of follow-up procedures to determine whether or not students admitted under any of these circumstances are successful, 59 have not. Tables 19 and 20 indicate the distribution of institutions by application of selective admissions policies and by the existence of follow-up procedures.

Of the 223 admissions officers who responded, 152 (68.2%) use the services of public and private agencies, 71 (31.8%) do not. Table 21 indicates the distribution of institutions which use the services of outside agencies. Table 22 indicates that the U.S. Office of Education's FCES, foreign embassies, the Institute of International Education, and the American Friends of the Middle East are the agencies which are most frequently used. Tables 23 and 24 indicate the approximate number of times outside agencies are used in one calendar year and the approximate percentage of total applications processed which these numbers represent.

TABLE 16. REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE DIRECTED TO PERSONS OUTSIDE OF THE FOREIGN STUDENT ADMISSIONS OFFICE

TYPE	OWN INSTITUTION YES	OWN INSTITUTION NO	OTHER INSTITUTIONS YES	OTHER INSTITUTIONS NO
Universities	87	7	71	23
Colleges	66	17	55	28
Jr. Colleges	28	7	25	10
Others	7	4	8	3
TOTALS	188	35	159	64

TABLE 17. RESOURCE PERSONNEL AT THE ADMISSIONS OFFICER'S OWN INSTITUTION WHO ARE MOST FREQUENTLY CONSULTED

RESOURCE	UNIVERSITIES	COLLEGES	JR. COLLEGES	OTHERS	TOTALS
Teaching Faculty	66	40	16	2	124
Dept. Chairmen	22	21	0	1	44
Deans	9	10	8	3	30
Foreign Student Advisor	5	9	4	0	18
Foreign Students	15	1	1	0	17
Admissions Officer	13	0	4	0	17
Registrar	3	10	2	0	15
Counselors	0	0	4	1	5
Foreign Lang. Depts.	2	1	0	0	3
E.S.L. Director	0	0	1	0	1
Fin. Aid Director	0	0	1	0	1

TABLE 18. FREQUENCY OF REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE DIRECTED TO ADMISSIONS OFFICERS EMPLOYED AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS

TYPE	1-9	10-24	25-49	50-74	75+
Universities	52	12	5	1	1
Colleges	50	5	0	0	0
Jr. Colleges	16	6	3	0	0
Others	7	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	125	24	8	1	1

TABLE 19. APPLICATION OF SELECTIVE ADMISSIONS POLICIES IN THREE DIFFERENT QUALITATIVE CIRCUMSTANCES

TYPE	LOW GPA HIGH QUALITY INST.	HIGH GPA LOW QUALITY INST.	AVERAGE GPA QUALITY OF INST. UNKNOWN
Universities	30	44	24
Colleges	21	26	25
Jr. Colleges	9	3	6
Others	4	4	4
TOTALS	64	77	59

TABLE 20. EXISTENCE OF FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES

TYPE	YES	NO
Universities	51	29
Colleges	43	22
Jr. Colleges	17	4
Others	6	4
TOTALS	117	59

TABLE 21. INSTITUTIONS WHICH USE THE SERVICES OF OUTSIDE AGENCIES

TYPE	YES	NO
Universities	73	21
Colleges	54	29
Jr. Colleges	17	18
Others	8	3
TOTALS	152	71

TABLE 22. OUTSIDE AGENCIES WHICH ARE USED

AGENCY	UNIVERSITIES	COLLEGES	JR. COLLEGES	OTHERS	TOTALS
OE-FCES	48	34	12	4	98
FOREIGN EMBASSIES	29	13	8	4	54
IIE	20	3	1	1	25
AMER. FRIENDS MID. EAST	9	2	1	0	12
AMER.-KOREAN FOUND.	3	0	0	0	3
AID	2	1	0	0	3
ASPAU	2	0	0	1	3
LASPAU	2	0	0	0	2
AFRICAN-AMER. INST.	0	2	0	0	2
PAN AMER. UNION	2	0	0	0	2
MIDWEST EVAL. PROJECT	0	2	0	0	2
AMER. ECON. ASSOC.	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE 23. FREQUENCY OF USE OF OUTSIDE AGENCIES*

TYPE	1-9	10-24	25-49	50-74	75-99	100-149	150+
Universities	31	14	3	3	4	1	2
Colleges	29	11	1	0	0	1	0
Jr. Colleges	10	4	0	0	0	0	
Others	4	1	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	74	30	4	3	4	2	2

TABLE 24. PERCENTAGE OF USE OF OUTSIDE AGENCIES*

TYPE	NEGLIGIBLE	LESS THAN 1%	1-9%	10-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-99%	100%
Universities	6	10	23	10	5	0	2	2
Colleges	3	4	11	17	2	3	1	1
Jr. Colleges	0	1	5	3	1	1	2	1
Others	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS	10	16	40	31	8	5	5	4

*Not all of the admissions officers were able to supply this information.

During the past calendar year, 86 of the 223 admissions officers who responded (38.6%) had used the Foreign Credential Evaluation Service of the U.S. Office of Education, 137 (61.4%) had not. 21 of those who had not used the FCES were not aware that its services were available. Table 25 indicates the distribution of institutions which had used the FCES during the past calendar year, while Table 26 indicates the approximate number of times it was used. Table 27 shows that 45 of the responding admissions officers tend to accept at face value information which is obtained from the FCES and other evaluation services, while 99 make their own interpretations of it.

Table 28 lists those features of the FCES which are most liked (positive), while Table 29 indicates those features which are most disliked (negative). The main positive features appear to be the fact that administrators, faculty and students tend to accept the evaluations as authoritative; that its evaluators are presumed to be experienced and knowledgeable; that it provides a convenient means for having credentials evaluated; and that it reports all of the desired information in a concise manner. The main negative features appear to be the fact that there is a considerable time lag before a response is received; that the reports are general in nature rather than detailed and specific; and that qualitative factors are not reported.

TABLE 25. INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE USED THE FCES DURING THE PAST CALENDAR YEAR

TYPE	YES	NO	NEVER HEARD OF IT
Universities	45	49	5
Colleges	31	52	8
Jr. Colleges	8	27	6
Others	2	9	2
TOTALS	86	137	21

TABLE 26. FREQUENCY OF USE OF THE FCES DURING THE PAST CALENDAR YEAR

TYPE	1-9	10-24	25-49	50-74	75-99	100-249	250+
Universities	29	10	1	1	3	0	1
Colleges	23	5	2	0	0	1	0
Jr. Colleges	6	2	0	0	0	0	0
Others	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	60	17	3	1	3	1	1

TABLE 27. USE OF INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM EVALUATION SERVICES

TYPE	TAKE AT FACE VALUE	MAKE OWN INTERPRETATIONS
Universities	18	49
Colleges	22	36
Jr. Colleges	3	12
Others	2	2
TOTALS	45	99

TABLE 28. POSITIVE FEATURES OF THE FCES

FEATURE	UNIVERSITIES	COLLEGES	JR. COLLEGES	OTHERS	TOTALS
Authoritative	9	8	3	1	21
Knowledgeable	8	4	4	1	17
Convenient	8	6	0	1	15
Concise	7	7	0	0	14
Prompt	5	3	1	0	9
Up-To-Date	2	0	0	0	2
Free	2	0	0	0	2

TABLE 29. NEGATIVE FEATURES OF THE FCES

FEATURE	UNIVERSITIES	COLLEGES	JR. COLLEGES	OTHERS	TOTALS
Too Slow	19	18	4	5	46
Too General	24	6	2	1	33
Not Qualitative	13	5	1	0	19
Too Conservative	1	2	0	0	3
Out-of-Date	1	1	0	0	2
Too Liberal	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE 30. INFORMATION WHICH A FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE SHOULD PROVIDE

	TYPE OF INFO.	UNIVERSITIES N	D	U	COLLEGES N	D	U	JR. COLLEGES N	D	U	OTHERS N	D	U	TOTALS N	D	U
QUANTITY	Equiv. of Degrees	78	15	1	64	10	9	26	6	3	9	0	2	177	31	15
	Years of Educ.	72	13	9	50	15	18	27	5	3	7	3	1	156	36	31
	Credits-Total	42	31	21	40	22	21	16	14	5	4	4	3	102	71	50
	Credits-Major	42	35	17	32	28	23	11	12	12	7	2	2	92	77	54
QUALITY	On Foreign Scale	58	32	4	50	20	13	16	10	9	3	3	5	127	65	31
	Comp. to U.S. Students	54	31	9	42	26	15	19	14	2	4	5	2	119	76	28
	Rep. of Institution	49	40	5	40	29	14	13	13	9	4	2	5	106	84	33
	Rep. of Country	42	41	11	37	28	18	11	13	11	4	2	5	94	84	45
	In Major Field	43	35	16	29	26	28	17	8	10	5	3	3	94	72	57

Key: N = Necessary, D = Desirable, U - Unnecessary

VII. INFORMATION WHICH THE RESPONDING ADMISSIONS OFFICERS FEEL A FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE SHOULD PROVIDE

177 of the 223 admissions officers who responded (79.4%) feel that it is necessary for a foreign credential evaluation service to provide information concerning the U.S. equivalence of a foreign student's certificates and degrees. 156 (69.9%) feel that information concerning the number of years of formal education which a student has completed is necessary. 127 (56.9%) want information concerning the quality of a student's academic work in terms of the grading scale of his

institution or country. 119 (53.3%) want information concerning the quality of his academic work compared to a U.S. grading scale. In regard to each of these items, a majority of the respondents (more than 53% in each case) feel that this type of information is necessary, a fairly large minority (ranging from 13.9 to 34.1%) feel that it is desirable but not necessary, and a small minority (less than 14% in each case) feel that it is unnecessary.

In regard to five other types of quantitative and qualitative information there is no majority position. Minorities ranging from 41.2 to 47.5% feel that a foreign credential evaluation service should provide information concerning the academic reputation of the institution(s) which a student has attended and of the educational system of his country, an approximation of the total number of credits which he has completed overall and in his major field, and an evaluation of his grades in his major field. Minorities ranging from 31.8 to 37.7% feel that this information is desirable but not necessary, and minorities ranging from 14.8 to 25.5% feel that it is unnecessary. If both "necessary" and "desirable" responses are combined, majorities ranging from 74.4 to 85.2% feel that information of this type ought to be provided by a foreign credential evaluation service. Table 30 indicates the distribution of opinions concerning these seven types of information.

VIII. ESTIMATED USE BY THE RESPONDING ADMISSIONS OFFICERS OF A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE

Of the 223 admissions officers who responded, 36 felt that they would use a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service regularly, 48 said frequently, 96 said occasionally, 24 said infrequently, and 19 said not at all. 83 admissions officers estimated that they would use such a service less than 10 times per year, 59 estimated 10-24 times, 24 estimated 25-49 times, 17 estimated 50-74 times, 11 estimated 74-99 times, and 10 estimated that they would use such a service more than 100 times per calendar year. Table 31 indicates the distribution of institutions by estimated frequency of use and by estimated volume of use.

TABLE 31. ESTIMATED USE BY THE RESPONDING ADMISSIONS OFFICERS OF A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE

A. ESTIMATED FREQUENCY

TYPE	REGULARLY	FREQUENTLY	OCCASIONALLY	INFREQUENTLY	NOT AT ALL
Universities	16	18	40	10	10
Colleges	15	22	35	5	6
Jr. Colleges	3	7	16	6	3
Others	2	1	5	3	0
TOTALS	36	48	96	24	19

B. ESTIMATED VOLUME

TYPE	1-9	10-24	25-49	50-74	75-99	100+
Universities	27	22	12	9	7	7
Colleges	35	25	8	5	2	2
Jr. Colleges	16	8	3	2	2	1
Others	5	4	1	1	0	0
TOTALS	83	59	24	17	11	10

IX. FEE ARRANGEMENTS PREFERRED BY THE RESPONDING ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

Of the 223 admissions officers who responded, 67 would prefer to obtain the services of a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service by paying an annual membership fee based upon the number of times they used the service (with the volume of use either estimated in advance or based upon the volume of use of the preceding year). 63 would prefer to pay a standard fee for each set of academic credentials submitted for evaluation. 52 would prefer to pay an annual membership fee based upon their foreign student enrollment. 41 would prefer to pay a combination of an annual membership fee based on their foreign student enrollment plus a standard fee for each set of academic credentials submitted for evaluation. Table 32 indicates the distribution of preferences for these four possible fee arrangements.

99 admissions officers indicated that they would prefer to be billed on an annual basis. 49 would prefer to enclose a fee with each set of academic credentials submitted for evaluation. 26 would prefer to be billed at the time that each set of academic credentials is submitted for evaluation. 20 would prefer to be billed semi-annually, 16 quarterly, and 13 monthly. Table 33 indicates the distribution of preferences for these six possible billing arrangements.

82 admissions officers indicated that the cost of using a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service would probably be added to future budgets as a new item of expense. 80 indicated that it would probably be absorbed in their regular budget. 47 indicated that it would probably be passed on to the applicant as a new fee or service charge, while 14 would pass it on as an increase in current application or filing fees. Table 34 indicates the distribution of institutions by probable source of funds.

TABLE 32. PREFERRED FEE ARRANGEMENT

FEE BASIS	UNIVERSITIES	COLLEGES	JR. COLLEGES	OTHERS	TOTALS
Membership (Enrollment)	29	15	6	2	52
Enrollment + Per Set	17	14	9	1	41
Per Set of Credentials	17	32	9	5	63
Membership (Volume)	31	22	11	3	67

TABLE 33. PREFERRED BILLING ARRANGEMENT

BILLING	UNIVERSITIES	COLLEGES	JR. COLLEGES	OTHERS	TOTALS
Annually	53	29	13	4	99
Semi-Annually	8	9	2	1	20
Quarterly	12	2	1	1	16
Monthly	5	5	2	1	13
Each Time (Billed)	7	14	5	0	26
Each Time (In Advance)	9	24	12	4	49

TABLE 34. PROBABLE SOURCE OF FUNDS

SOURCE	UNIVERSITIES	COLLEGES	JR. COLLEGES	OTHERS	TOTALS
Regular Budget	34	31	10	5	80
Future Budgets	40	31	8	3	82
New Fee	12	18	15	2	47
Increased Fee	8	3	2	1	14

PART III ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OBTAINED FROM AGENCIES

X. DESCRIPTION OF THE FOREIGN STUDENT INVOLVEMENTS OF THE RESPONDING AGENCIES

As was indicated in Chapter IV, four federal and two private agencies were contacted for conferences, while 21 state teacher certification boards and 20 state nursing licensing boards were contacted via a questionnaire.

The 18 state teacher certification boards which responded evaluate foreign academic credentials in the process of reviewing applications for elementary and secondary teacher certification. The 15 state nursing licensing boards which responded evaluate foreign academic credentials in the process of reviewing applications for licensing as a registered nurse. Three of the offices of the U.S. federal government which responded evaluate foreign academic credentials in the process of reviewing petitions for immigration to the United States, particularly under the third preference category (aliens who are members of the professions or who have exceptional ability in the sciences or arts) and the sixth preference category (aliens who are skilled or unskilled workers in areas of employment for which there is a shortage of qualified personnel). One of the federal offices is involved with matters of policy only and does not get involved in the actual evaluation of foreign academic credentials. The one private agency which responded evaluates foreign academic credentials in the process of placing foreign students in U.S. institutions of higher learning.

4 of the 38 agencies which responded evaluate less than ten sets of foreign academic credentials per calendar year. 3 evaluate 10-19, 4 evaluate 20-49, 9 evaluate 50-99, 9 evaluate 100-499, 2 evaluate 500-999, and 6 evaluate over 1000. Table 35 indicates the distribution of agencies by number of sets of credentials evaluated per year.

4 of the agencies work with academic credentials from fewer than ten countries per year, 15 with credentials from 10-19 countries, 12 from 20-49 countries, 4 from 50-99 countries, and 2 from more than 100 countries. Table 36 indicates the distribution of agencies by number of countries represented by the foreign academic credentials which they evaluate.

TABLE 35. TOTAL NUMBER OF SETS OF FOREIGN ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS EVALUATED BY THE RESPONDING AGENCIES

TYPE	1-9	10-19	20-49	59-99	100-499	500-999	1000+	TOTALS
Teacher	1	1	3	4	5	1	3	18
Nursing	3	2	1	5	3	0	1	15
Federal	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3*
Private	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
TOTALS	4	3	4	9	9	2	6	37

TABLE 36. NUMBER OF COUNTRIES REPRESENTED BY THE FOREIGN ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS EVALUATED BY THE AGENCIES EACH YEAR

TYPE	1-9	10-19	20-49	50-99	100+	TOTALS
Teacher	3	6	6	1	2	18
Nursing	1	8	4	2	0	15
Federal	0	0	2	1	0	3*
Private	0	1	0	0	0	1
TOTALS	4	15	12	4	2	37

*One of the responding offices is involved with matters of policy only and does not get involved in the actual evaluation of foreign academic credentials.

XI. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOLLOWED BY THE RESPONDING AGENCIES

28 of the 38 agencies which responded evaluate secondary school credentials, 36 evaluate baccalaureate-level credentials, and 17 evaluate post-baccalaureate level credentials. 7 agencies are concerned only with the quantity of education represented by academic records, while 30 are concerned with both quantity and quality. None of the agencies are concerned with quality alone. Tables 37 and 38 indicate the distribution of agencies according to the academic level of the credentials which they evaluate and according to their quantitative and qualitative areas of concern.

When determining the quantity of education which is represented by foreign academic credentials, 29 agencies are concerned with the number of years of formal education which an applicant has completed. 28 are concerned with the approximate equivalence of an applicant's certificates and diplomas to U.S. degrees (such as our A.A., B.A., M.A., Ph.D). 24 are concerned with the approximate number of credits which an applicant has completed in his major field. 19 are concerned with the approximate number of credits which an applicant has completed in all subjects studied thus far. Table 39 indicates the distribution of agencies by concern for these four clues to the quantity of education which an applicant has completed.

When determining the quality of education which is represented by foreign academic credentials, 10 agencies are concerned with an applicant's overall grade average (gpa). 8 are concerned with his grade average in his major field. 4 are concerned with his rank in class. 26 are concerned with the academic reputation of the institution(s) which he has attended. 25 are concrned with the academic reputation of his country's educational system. Table 40 indicates the distribution of agencies by concern for these five clues to the quality of the education which an applicant has completed.

TABLE 37. LEVEL OF CREDENTIALS EVALUATED BY AGENCIES

TYPE	SECONDARY	BACCALAUREATE	POST-BACCALAUREATE
Teacher	13	18	13
Nursing	14	14*	0
Federal	0	3	3
Private	1	1	1
TOTALS	28	36	17

*This may mean "professional" rather than "baccalaureate" for those applicants who have completed an R.N. program without simultaneously earning a Bachelor's degree.

TABLE 38. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE AREAS OF CONCERN

TYPE	QUANTITY	QUALITY	BOTH
Teacher	2	0	16
Nursing	2	0	13
Federal	3	0	0
Private	0	0	1
TOTALS	7	0	30

TABLE 39. CONCERN FOR FOUR CLUES TO THE QUANTITY OF EDUCATION WHICH AN APPLICANT HAS COMPLETED

TYPE	NUMBER OF YEARS	DEGREE EQUIV.	CREDITS-MAJOR	CREDITS-TOTAL
Teacher	14	18	13	12
Nursing	12	6	9	5
Federal	2	3	1	1
Private	1	1	1	1
TOTALS	29	28	24	19

TABLE 40. CONCERN FOR FIVE CLUES TO THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION WHICH AN APPLICANT HAS COMPLETED

TYPE	GPA	GPA-MAJOR	RANK-IN-CLASS	INSTITUTION	COUNTRY
Teacher	6	4	2	12	11
Nursing	3	3	1	10	7
Federal	0	0	0	3*	0
Private	1	1	1	1	7
TOTALS	10	8	4	26	25

*Only in terms of whether or not an institution is recognized as a bona fide degree granting institution by whatever system of "accreditation" exists in its country.

TABLE 41. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE ASSIGNED TO THREE QUALITY CLUES

TYPE	OVERALL GPA	QUALITY OF INSTITUTION	QUALITY OF SYSTEM	EQUAL EMPHASIS
Teacher	0	4	2	8
Nursing	0	2	2	6
Federal	0	0	0	0
Private	0	0	0	1
TOTALS	0	6	4	15

TABLE 42. MAJOR RESOURCES CONSULTED FOR QUALITY CLUES IN ORDER TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN THE QUALITY OF INSTITUTIONS WITHIN A GIVEN COUNTRY AND BETWEEN THE QUALITY OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

RESOURCE	TEACHER	NURSING	FEDERAL	PRIVATE	TOTALS
OE-FCES	5	2	3*	0	10
Local Foreign Student Admissions Officers	2	0	1	0	3
Int'l Council of Nurses	0	5	0	0	5
Past Experience	1	0	0	1	2
World Health Organization	0	1	0	0	1
Own Staff	0	0	0	1	1
Published Reference Works	0	0	0	0	0

None of the 38 agencies which responded place more emphasis on the quality of an applicant's overall grade average than on other qualitative factors. However, 6 agencies do place relatively more emphasis on the quality of the institution(s) which an applicant has attended, while 4 place relatively more emphasis on the quality of the educational system of his country. 15 agencies tend to place equal emphasis on all three of these quality clues. Table 41 indicates the distribution of agencies by the relative importance which they assign to these three quality clues.

Table 42 indicates the major resources which the responding agencies consult when trying to differentiate between the quality of institutions within a given country and between the quality of the educational systems of different countries. They tend to rely primarily upon such resources as the U.S. Office of Education's Foreign Credential Evaluation Service, the International Council of Nurses, and Foreign Student Admissions Officers who are employed at local universities. It is interesting to note that none of the agencies indicated that published reference works (such as AACRAO's World Education Series) are a major resource, although this was the resource most frequently mentioned by the responding admissions officers (*cf.* Table 15, *page* 17).

Of those agencies which have selective approval policy, 4 tend to approve an applicant who has a relatively low grade average from a high quality institution, 2 tend to approve an applicant who has a relatively high grade average from a relatively low quality institution, and 4 tend to approve an applicant who has an average gpa from an institution whose academic reputation is unknown to them. 5 agencies have developed some type of follow-up procedures to determine whether or not applicants approved under any of these circumstances are successful, 3 have not. Tables 43 and 44 indicate the distribution of agencies by application of selective approval policies and by the existence of follow-up procedures.

TABLE 43. APPLICATION OF SELECTIVE APPROVAL POLICIES IN THREE DIFFERENT QUALITATIVE CIRCUMSTANCES

TYPE	LOW GPA HIGH QUALITY INST.	HIGH GPA LOW QUALITY INST.	AVERAGE GPA QUALITY OF INST. UNKNOWN
Teaching	1	0	2
Nursing	2	1	2
Federal	0	0	0
Private	1	1	0
TOTALS	4	2	4

TABLE 44. EXISTENCE OF FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES

TYPE	YES	NO
Teacher	2	1
Nursing	2	2
Federal	-	-
Private	1	-
TOTALS	5	3

TABLE 45. DISTRIBUTION OF AGENCIES WHICH MAKE THEIR OWN EVALUATIONS OF FOREIGN EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS

TYPE	YES	NO
Teacher	12	6
Nursing	10	5
Federal	3	1
Private	1	0
TOTALS	26	12

TABLE 46. DISTRIBUTION OF AGENCIES WHICH REFER FOREIGN EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS TO OTHER AGENCIES FOR EVALUATION

TYPE	REGULARLY	FREQUENTLY	NOT AT ALL
Teacher	9	7	2
Nursing	3	8	4
Federal	0	3	1
Private	0	1	0
TOTALS	12	19	7

26 of the 38 agencies which responded make their own evaluations of foreign educational credentials, 12 do not. 12 refer foreign educational credentials to other agencies for evaluation on a regular basis, 19 do so frequently, and 7 make no such referrals at all. Of those which do make referrals to other agencies, 5 do so less than 10 times per year, 6 do so 10-19 times per year, 6 do so 20-49 times, 6 do so 50-99 times 6 do so 100-499 times, and 2 do so more than 500 times per year. Table 45 indicates the distribution of agencies which make their own evaluations of foreign educational credentials. Table 46 indicates the distribution of agencies which refer foreign educational credentials to other agencies for evaluation, Table 47 indicates the frequency of such referrals, and Table 48 indicates which agencies are used. The FCES is the outside agency which is used most often. The second most frequently used resource is the foreign student admissions officer at a local university.

During the past calendar year, 25 agencies have used the Foreign Credential Evaluation Service of the U.S. Office of Education, 13 have not. Table 49 indicates the distribution of agencies which have used the FCES during the past calendar year. Table 50 lists those features of the FCES which are most liked (positive), while Table 51 lists those which are most disliked (negative). The main positive features appear to be the fact that the FCES staff is expected to be knowledgeable and to have the most up-to-date information available, that evaluations are received rather quickly, and that administrators and applicants tend to accept the evaluations as authoritative. The main negative features appear to be the fact that the evaluation reports are too general, and that there is a considerable time lag before a response is received (!)

TABLE 47. FREQUENCY OF REFFERALS TO OTHER AGENCIES

TYPE	1-9	10-19	20-49	50-99	100-499	500-999	1000+
Teacher	2	2	4	4	3	1	0
Nursing	3	4	1	2	1	0	0
Federal	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
Private	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	5	6	6	6	6	1	1

TABLE 48. OUTSIDE AGENCIES WHICH ARE USED

AGENCY	TEACHER	NURSING	FEDERAL	PRIVATE	TOTALS
OE-PCES	14	6	3	1	24
For. Student Adm. Off. at Local Universities	5	5	1	0	10
For. Lang. Dept. at Local Universities	4	0	0	0	4
Foreign Embassies	0	1	0	1	2
Foreign Students	0	1	0	0	1
Pan Amer. Union	1	0	0	0	1
Int'l Council of Nurses	0	1	0	0	1

TABLE 49. AGENCIES WHICH HAVE USED THE PCES DURING THE PAST CALENDAR YEAR

TYPE	YES	NO
Teacher	14	4
Nursing	8	7
Federal	3	1
Private	0	1
TOTALS	25	13

TABLE 50. POSITIVE FEATURES OF THE FCES

FEATURE	TEACHER	NURSING	FEDERAL	PRIVATE	TOTALS
Knowledgeable	2	3	3	1	9
Prompt	7	1	1	0	9
Authoritative	4	1	3	0	8
Up-To-Date	2	3	1	1	7
Convenient	3	1	0	1	5
Concise	2	1	0	0	3
Free	0	1	0	0	1

TABLE 51. NEGATIVE FEATURES OF THE FCES

FEATURE	TEACHER	NURSING	FEDERAL	PRIVATE	TOTALS
Too General	8	2	1	0	11
Too Slow	4	1	1	0	6
Too Conservative	3	0	0	0	3
Not Qualitative	1	0	0	0	1
Sometimes Equivocal	0	0	1	0	1

XII. INFORMATION WHICH THE RESPONDING AGENCIES FEEL A FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE SHOULD PROVIDE

28 of the 38 agencies which responded (73.7%) feel that it is necessary for a foreign credential evaluation service to provide information concerning the U.S. equivalence of a foreign applicant's certificates and degrees. 24 (63.2%) feel that information concerning the number of years of formal education which an applicant has completed is necessary. In regard to these two items, a majority of the respondents feel that this information is necessary, minorities of 10.5 and 23.7% feel that it is desirable but not necessary, and minorities of 15.8 and 13.2% feel that it is unnecessary.

In regard to two other types of quantitative information and five types of qualitative information there is no majority position. Minorities ranging from 31.6 to 44.7% feel that a foreign credential evaluation service should provide information concerning the quality of an applicant's academic records in terms of the grading scale of his institution or country and compared to a U.S. grading scale, information concerning the academic reputation of the institution(s) which he has attended and of the educational system of his country, an approximation of the total number of credits which he has completed overall and in his major field, and an evaluation of the grades which he earned in his major field. Minorities ranging from 21.0% to 31.6% feel that this information is desirable but not necessary, and minorities ranging from 23.7% to 47.4% feel that it is unnecessary. If both "necessary" and "desirable" responses are combined, majorities ranging from 52.6 to 76.3% feel that information of this type ought to be provided by a foreign credential evaluation service. Table 52 indicates the distribution of opinions concerning these seven types of information.

XIII. ESTIMATED USE BY THE RESPONDING AGENCIES OF A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE

Of the 38 agencies which responded, 11 felt that they would use a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service regularly, 14 said frequently, 6 said occasionally, 3 said infrequently, and 4 said not at all. 3 estimated that they would use such a service fewer than ten times per year, 8 estimated 10-24 times, 8 estimated 25-49 times, 4 estimated 50-74 times, 3 estimated 75-99 times, 2 estimated 100-199 times, 4 estimated 200-499 times, 1 estimated 500-999 times, and 1 estimated that they would use such a service more than 1000 times per calendar year. Table 53 indicates the distribution of agencies by estimated frequency of use and by estimated volume of use.

TABLE 52. INFORMATION WHICH A FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE SHOULD PROVIDE

	TYPE OF INFO.	TEACHER			NURSING			FEDERAL			PRIVATE			TOTALS		
		N	D	U	N	D	U	N	D	U	N	D	U	N	D	U
QUANTITY	Equiv. of Degrees	15	1	2	8	3	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	28	4	6
QUANTITY	Years of Educ.	10	5	3	10	3	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	24	9	5
QUANTITY	Credits-Total	5	6	7	7	3	5	0	0	4	1	0	0	13	9	16
QUANTITY	Credits-Major	9	7	2	7	3	5	0	2	2	1	0	0	17	12	9
QUALITY	On Foreign Scale	5	5	8	7	2	6	0	0	4	0	1	0	12	8	18
QUALITY	Comp. to U.S. Students	10	4	4	7	3	5	0	0	4	0	1	0	17	8	13
QUALITY	Rep. of Institution	6	7	5	7	4	4	4*	0	0	0	1	0	17	12	9
QUALITY	Rep. of Country	6	7	5	7	4	4	0	0	4	0	1	0	13	12	13
QUALITY	In Major Field	6	8	4	8	2	5	0	0	4	0	1	0	14	11	13

*Only in terms of "accreditation" by whatever system exists in its country.

Key: N = Necessary, D = Desirable, U - Unnecessary

TABLE 53. ESTIMATED USE BY THE RESPONDING AGENCIES OF A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE

A. ESTIMATED FREQUENCY

TYPE	REGULARLY	FREQUENTLY	OCCASIONALLY	INFREQUENTLY	NOT AT ALL
Teacher	6	7	3	1	1
Nursing	5	4	2	2	2
Federal	0	3	0	0	1
Private	0	0	1	0	0
TOTALS	11	14	6	3	4

B. ESTIMATED VOLUME

TYPE	1-9	10-24	25-49	50-74	75-99	100-199	200-499	500-999	1000+
Teacher	1	3	5	3	2	1	1	1	0
Nursing	2	5	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
Private	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	3	8	8	4	3	2	4	1	1

XIV. FEE ARRANGEMENTS PREFERRED BY THE RESPONDING AGENCIES

Of the 38 agencies which responded, 12 would prefer to obtain the services of a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service by paying a standard fee for each set of educational credentials submitted for evaluation. 10 would prefer to pay an annual membership fee based upon the number of times they used the service (with the volume of use either estimated in advance or based upon the volume of use of the preceding year). 5 would prefer to pay a combination of an annual membership fee of some type plus a standard fee for each set of educational credentials submitted for evaluation. 11 stated that they would prefer to have the cost of the evaluation service billed directly to the student. Table 54 indicates the distribution of preferences for these four possible fee arrangements.

8 agencies indicated that they would prefer to be billed on an annual basis. 7 would prefer to enclose a fee with each set of educational credentials submitted for evaluation. 5 would prefer to be billed quarterly, 4 monthly. 3 would prefer to be billed at the time that each set of educational credentials is submitted for evaluation. 11 would prefer to have the bill sent directly to the applicant. Table 55 indicates the distribution of preferences for these billing arrangements.

11 of the agencies indicated that the cost of using a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service would probably be added to future budgets as a new item of expense. 9 indicated that it would probably be passed on to the applicant as a new fee or service charge, while 4 would probably pass it on as an increase in current application or filing fees. 3 indicated that the cost would probably be absorbed in their regular budget. Of the 11 agencies which would prefer to have the applicant billed directly, 4 indicated that current laws and/or regulations prohibit them from either collecting or paying such a fee. Table 56 indicates the distribution of agencies by probable source of funds.

TABLE 54. PREFERRED FEE ARRANGEMENT

FEE BASIS	TEACHER	NURSING	FEDERAL	PRIVATE	TOTALS
Per Set of Credentials	5	6	1	0	12
Membership (Volume)	6	1	3	0	10
Membership + Per Set	3	1	0	1	5
Bill to Applicant	4	7	0	0	11

TABLE 55. PREFERRED BILLING ARRANGEMENT

BILLING	TEACHER	NURSING	FEDERAL	PRIVATE	TOTALS
Annually	6	0	2	0	8
Semi-Annually	0	0	0	0	0
Quarterly	1	2	1	1	5
Monthly	1	2	1	0	4
Each Time (Billed)	0	3	0	0	3
Each Time (In Advance)	6	1	0	0	7
Bill to Applicant	4	7	0	0	11

Table 56. PROBABLE SOURCE OF FUNDS

SOURCE	TEACHER	NURSING	FEDERAL	PRIVATE	TOTALS
Regular Budget	2	1	0	0	3
Future Budgets	4	3	3	1	11
New Fee	7	2	0	0	9
Increased Fee	1	2	1	0	4
Bill to Applicant	4	7	0	0	11

PART IV. S U M M A R Y

XV. FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not it would be feasible to establish under non-governmental auspices a central foreign credential evaluation service which would serve universities, colleges, governmental and private agencies. The institutions and agencies which furnished data for this study were almost unanimous in declaring that they know of no reason why it cannot be done.

Of the 261 institutions and agencies which responded to the study (either in a conference or via the mailed questionnaire), only one suggested that a non-governmental FCES would suffer from lack of prestige. This comment was made by the director of a state department of education who feels that such a service offered "by a private or quasi-public agency is not likely to carry the prestige currently attached <u>by applicants</u> to the evaluations we are receiving from the USOE". (The italics are his). 9 of the 120 admissions officers who participated in the conferences raised similar questions, but they added that if such a service were to begin with the official publicized endorsement of the U.S. Office of Education and the five associations which constitute the National Liaison Committee, the prestige of those organizations would give a non-governmental FCES more than enough prestige to get started. It was generally agreed by all of the respondents that once such a service were established and in full operation, its prestige and reputation would be based almost exclusively upon the quality of its evaluations, and that it would receive very little if any carryover from the prestige of its endorsers.

The dean of admissions of one university stated that the operation of a FCES was part of the obligation of the U.S. Office of Education to serve institutions of higher education in the U.S., and that he was therefore firmly opposed to any curtailment or termination of the FCES. On the contrary, he felt quite strongly that it ought to be continued and improved, and that both its current budget and

staff ought to be expanded considerably so that academic institutions could obtain better, more complete and more up-to-date evaluations with a much shorter time lag. 18 other admissions officers (representing academic institutions in seven states) raised similar objections to the termination of the FCES by the U.S. Office of Education. However, all agreed that if the U.S. Office of Education were already irrevocably committed to the termination of the FCES, a non-governmental FCES should be established to take its place.

38 institutions and 7 agencies voiced concern for the nature of the research foundation upon which a non-governmental FCES would be based. They stressed that such a service would be of little value unless it would be equipped (in terms of both budget and staff) to obtain as complete and up-to-date information as it is possible to collect. They suggested that the FCES staff would have to be in frequent communication with the Comparative Education Staff of the Office of Education, with the Council on Evaluation of Foreign Student Credentials, with the overseas staffs of such organizations as IIE, AFME, and AKF, with U.S.I.S., U.S.E.F., and UNESCO staffs throughout the world, with Ministries of Education, with educational and cultural attaches at foreign embassies, consulates and missions in the United States, with educational and cultural attaches at U.S. embassies and consulates throughout the world, and with the admissions officers of those U.S. universities and colleges which have large foreign student enrollments. They also suggested that a non-governmental FCES might make small supplementary grants to foreign student admissions officers who were going overseas, both to finance short extensions of their travel plans so that they could collect data which would be needed by the FCES and to assist them in preparing reports on the information which they have obtained. 5 admissions officers suggested that the FCES ought to be briefed as soon as possible by every foreign student admissions officer, agency representative, and embassy or consular official who has completed any pertinent research while in the U.S. or overseas.

There was no consensus concerning the organizational structure which a non-governmental FCES should have. Some of the respondents felt that it ought to be established as a branch or section of an existing agency which is currently working in the field of foreign student admissions, others thought that it ought to be established as a new, independent organization without formal organizational ties to any other. Those who recommended the branch arrangment felt that it might give the FCES a more firm foundation during the time it is trying to get established, might make the possible future use of computers more feasible, and might make it easier and less expensive to provide such fringe benefits as health insurance and retirement programs. Those who recommended the independent arrangement thought that it might give the FCES more flexibility in structure, impose fewer restrictions on office size and location, and avoid any possibility of the involvement of the FCES in the budgetary, space, personnel, and political problems of any other organization. There were no significant differences between the views of institutional and agency representatives on these points.

There was no consensus concerning the location of a non-governmental FCES. Some of the respondents felt that it ought to be located in New York or Washington D.C., in order to be as close as possible to the staffs of foreign embassies, consulates, and missions, to the Comparative Education Staff of the U.S. Office of Education, and to the central offices of other associations and agencies which work in this and related fields. Others thought that it ought to be located elsewhere, perhaps somewhere in the midwest, so that the non-governmental FCES would be removed from any possible confusion with the FCES currently operated by the U.S. Office of Education, so that it would be more accessible to foreign student admissions officers who might wish to visit the FCES for consultations, briefings, seminars, and workshops, and so that the FCES staff would be more accessible for visits to institutions and agencies. They argued that most of the FCES staff's contacts with embassies, consulates, missions, associations, agencies, and the Comparative Education Staff would probably be by mail or telephone and in

meetings, rather than by personal visits to one another's offices, and that these types of activities would not be seriously affected by the location of the FCES outside of the New York and Washington D.C. areas. They also felt that the expenses of renting and operating a FCES office might be lower away from those two metropolitan areas. One admissions officer suggested that the FCES ought to be located at a large university center in a metropolitan area, since such a location would furnish a large manpower pool and both educational and cultural advantages for the staff.

There were no significant differences between the views of institutional and agency representatives on these points. Two of the federal agency representatives felt that a Washington D.C. location of the FCES would be more convenient for them, but they said that they would have no objections to its being located elsewhere as long as that did not result in an unreasonable delay in the service.

XVI. INFORMATION WHICH SHOULD BE PROVIDED BY A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE

Most of the respondents thought that the following types of information should be provided by a non-governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service:

1. Information concerning the U.S. equivalence of foreign certificates and degrees. 205 respondents (78.5%) thought that this information is necessary, 35 (13.4%) that it is desirable. This information is currently being provided by the FCES.
2. Information concerning the total number of years of formal education which a foreign student or applicant has completed. 180 respondents (68.9%) felt that this information is necessary, 45 (17.2%) that it is desirable. This information is currently being provided by the FCES.
3. Information concerning the quality of a student's academic work in terms of the qualitative rating system of his institution or country. This category of information might include such things as a description of

the complete grading scale (with particular emphasis on the maximum possible grade and the minimum passing grade), an indication of the usual distribution of students (those who pass and those who fail) in the major subdivisions of the qualitative rating system (such as "first class, second class"), and an indication of the minimum qualitative level which is ordinarily required for admission to undergraduate or graduate work at the student's institution or in his country. 139 respondents (53.2%) indicated that this information is necessary, 73 (28.0%) that it is desirable. Most of the respondents acknowledged that this type of information will not always be available on each institution and country. However, they felt that it should be provided by the FCES in those cases where it is available. This type of information is not currently provided by the FCES. However, it is provided by such agencies as IIE in response to specific questions posed by foreign student admissions officers.

Another 108 respondents (41.4%) thought that this type of information is also needed concerning the quality of a student's work in his major field (considered apart from his overall grade average). 83 respondents (31.8%) thought that this information is desirable.

4. Information concerning the quality of a student's academic work compared to a U.S. grading scale. This category of information might include such things as a suggested guide for comparing the foreign qualitative rating system to a U.S. 4.0 scale and an estimate of the type of academic institution in the U.S. at which the foreign student might best be placed. 136 respondents (52.1%) felt that this information is necessary, 84 (32.2%) that it is desirable. This type of information is not currently provided by the FCES. However, it is provided by foreign student admissions consultants via the AACRAO/AID contract to the Office of International Training of AID to assist in the placement of A.I.D. - sponsored students.

5. Information concerning the academic reputation of the institution(s) which a student has attended. This category of information might include such things as whether the institution is recognized as degree-granting by the Ministry of Education of its country, whether its degrees are accepted for admission to advanced degree programs by the major academic institution in its country, whether work taken toward a bachelor's degree (or equivalent) is accepted for transfer toward a similar degree at other institutions in its country, and whether the institution has a reputation for being excellent overall and/or for offering an excellent academic program in the student's field. 123 respondents (47.1%) indicated that this information is necessary, 96 (36.8%) that it is desirable. This type of information is currently being provided by the FCES only in response to specific questions posed by foreign student admissions officers.

6. Information concerning the approximate number of credits which a student has completed overall and in his major field. This information might be expressed in terms of either semester or quarter credits. 115 and 109 respondents (44.0% and 41.7%, respectively) felt that these two categories of information are necessary, 80 and 89 (30.6% and 34.1%, respectively) that they are desirable. This information is not currently provided by the FCES. However, 152 and 149 respondents (58.2 and 57.1%, respectively) have stated that they try to determine this information when they evaluate foreign educational credentials (cf. Tables 10 and 39, pages 14 and 31, respectively).

7. Information concerning the academic reputation of the educational system of a student's country. This category of information might include such things as the comparison of elementary and secondary institutions in major cities vs. rural areas, the minimum educational and training requirements for elementary and secondary teachers, the admissions selectivity of secondary and post-secondary institutions, and any

general or specific information which might be available concerning the success or failure rate of students from that country in U.S. institutions of higher education. (This last type of information might be made available through research projects such as the study of 1000 U.S. government-sponsored foreign students which is currently being undertaken under the AACRAO/AID contract). 107 respondents (41.0%) thought that this information is necessary, 96 (36.8%) that it is desirable. Most of the respondents acknowledged that this type of information will not always be available on each country, but they felt that it should be provided by the FCES in those cases where it is available. This type of information is currently provided by the FCES only in response to specific questions posed by foreign student admissions officers.

Other types of information which the respondents suggested that the FCES ought to provide include:

1. A selected bibliography of published information pertaining to the student's institution or country, including references to specific pages where appropriate.
2. An indication of the student's probable proficiency in English, especially in those cases where broad generalizations can be made concerning students who have been educated in another medium or who come from a particular institution, region, or country.
3. Information concerning the probability of the student's needing financial assistance, especially in those cases where the student's dossier contains clues which might be overlooked by an inexperienced admissions officer.
4. Information concerning the content of secondary and post-secondary level courses in mathematics and science where this can be determined. Of special interest is information concerning the trigonometry and calculus portions of math courses and the laboratory portions of science courses.

5. Information concerning the comparison of technical and teacher training programs to similar programs offered in the United States.

6. Information concerning the probable content (in terms of courses completed and certificates earned) of education completed by students whose academic records are incomplete due to war or political turmoil.

It was suggested by many admissions officers and several agencies that the FCES ought to share with institutions and agencies all information which it obtains (through both primary and secondary research) so that those institutions and agencies which make their own evaluations of foreign educational credentials can be kept up-to-date on educational developments around the world. They felt that this could be done by means of workshops and seminars (both initiated by the FCES and those sponsored by others), by participation by the FCES staff in the local, regional, and national meetings of such associations as AACRAO, CEEB, and NAFSA, and by the publication of a regular newsletter or fact sheet, such as the "International report" column which currently appears in the NAFSA Newsletter.

Several admissions officers felt that once a non-governmental FCES was firmly established (i.e., after approximately five years of full operation) it ought to establish a "consultant" program through which experienced admissions officers could serve the FCES for short periods of time in order to effect an exchange of information and opinions concerning the evaluation of foreign educational credentials and the admission of foreign students. Several other admissions officers felt that a non-governmental FCES should eventually establish an "internship" program whereby new admissions officers (e.g. with one month to one year of experience) could be trained in the evaluation of foreign educational credentials (with part, most, or all of their salary to be paid by the FCES or by their institution).

Two admissions officers suggested that the FCES might eventually take a leadership role in the dissemination overseas of accurate and up-to-date information concerning education in the U.S. in general, concerning particular post-

secondary institutions which are well-equipped to handle foreign students and which are interested in encouraging their enrollment, and concerning the procedures which a prospective foreign student should follow in seeking admission, so that his papers are processed with maximum accuracy and efficiency. One admissions officer also suggested that in the somewhat distant future the FCES might expand its role to include serving as a foreign student admissions clearing house, presuming that such activity would be agreeable both to the FCES staff and to the academic institutions which use its services.

XVII. ESTIMATE OF THE VOLUME OF USE WHICH A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE MIGHT ANTICIPATE

In fiscal 1968 the Foreign Credential Evaluation Service operated by the Comparative Education Staff of the U.S. Office of Education processed approximately 14,000 requests for the evaluation of foreign academic credentials. It is estimated by the Staff that a total of 17,000 to 20,000 requests will be processed during fiscal 1969.

In fiscal 1968 approximately 24% of the evaluations were requested by federal agencies, 29% by state and local agencies, 12% by private agencies and individuals, and approximately 35% by academic institutions. Due to a relatively large increase in the number of evaluations now being requested by the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, it is estimated that the percentage of requests received from federal agencies will be increased to approximately 35% of the total for fiscal 1969. This would result in a reduction of the percentages for state and local agencies, private agencies and individuals, and academic institutions to approximately 24%, 11%, and 30%, respectively (based upon an estimate of 6000 requests from federal agencies in fiscal 1969, 4100 from state and local agencies, 1900 from private agencies and individuals, and 5100 from academic institutions).

Of the four federal agencies which furnished data for this study, three are involved with the actual evaluation of foreign educational credentials, one is not.

The three which are involved estimated that because of the large increase in the number of third and sixth preference visa petitions which are now being filed and which are expected to be filed each year for the foreseeable future, the number of evaluation requests which they refer to the FCES will continue to increase, probably at the rate of 15-20% per year.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is just now beginning to maintain a Service-wide file of previous evaluations received from the FCES, to which Immigration Officers can refer for information when they receive a particular kind of academic credential for the first time. However, because the information contained in this file is very brief and because the educational systems of the world are continually being changed, the representatives of the three federal agencies felt that this reference file would not even begin to make up for the increase in volume which they are now experiencing and which they anticipate will continue. If an increase of 15% is therefore presumed for all federal agencies, a non-governmental FCES might anticipate receiving approximately 7000 requests for evaluation per year from federal agencies.

The 33 state agencies which furnished data for this study indicated that they might use a non-governmental FCES approximately 2600 times per year, an increase of approximately 81% over the 1430 times which they used the FCES of the U.S. Office of Education last year. If this increase can be presumed to apply to other state agencies as well, a non-governmental FCES might expect to receive approximately 7500 requests for evaluation per year from state agencies.

The one private agency which furnished data for this study indicated that it might use a non-governmental FCES approximately the same number of times which it now used the FCES of the U.S. Office of Education. If it is presumed that this will also be true of other private agencies, a non-governmental FCES might expect to receive approximately 1900 requests for evaluation per year from private agencies and individuals.

The 223 academic institutions which furnished data for this study indicated

that if the services offered by a non-governmental FCES were speedy and included qualitative information, they might use it approximately 5200 times per year, an increase of approximately 356% over the 1467 times which they used the FCES of the U.S. Office of Education last year. If this increase can be presumed to apply to other academic institutions as well, a non-governmental evaluation service might expect to receive approximately 18,000 requests per year from academic institutions.

These four estimates total 34,400, which would be approximately twice the volume of requests currently handled by the FCES. At first glance this total may appear to be extremely high. Most of the anticipated increase would come from academic institutions and state agencies, however, and these two categories of users are the ones which indicated that they are most intersted in the possibility of speeding up and expanding the services offered by the FCES. If the FCES is expanded to include qualitative types of information (such as those described in XVI above), and if the service is improved so that there is a time lag of less than ten days, it seems evident that both academic institutions and state agencies will begin to make much more frequent use of it than they do now. (The Comparative Education Staff estimates that the current delay within the FCES ranges from 5 days for requests concerning African countries to 5 weeks for requests concerning countries in the Far East).

Whether or not an improved and speedier service would generate an increase which is as great as that estimated above cannot be accurately determined at this time, since this feasibility study was designed to collect opinions, preferences, and approximations rather than verifiable statistical data. However, the information which was furnished by the responding institutions and agencies seems to indicate quite clearly that a non-governmental FCES can expect to receive a volume of requests which at least equals the current FCES volume of approximately 17,000 requests per year, and that there exists a potential demand of an additional 17,000 requests which the FCES may or may not wish to develop.

Because the FCES now evaluates foreign educational credentials free of charge, and the non-governmental FCES will most probably need to charge for its services, the resulting fiscal change may cause some institutions and agencies to curtail their use of the FCES. Most of the admissions officers and agency representatives who responded to this study felt, however, that implementation of the suggested improvements in the service would tend to counter-balance any decrease in use which might be caused by financial and budgetary problems.

Several of the responding admissions officers indicated that they expected that it would take a non-governmental FCES three to five years to get into full operation, to build up to full volume, and to become self-supporting. They felt that any initial hesitance on the part of institutions and agencies to use an evaluation service for which they would now be charged would be slowly overcome as the services of the FCES were publicized by the U.S. Office of Education, the members of the National Liaison Committee, and the institutions and agencies which are the first to receive evaluation reports. They cautioned that the service will have to be very good if its clients are to be expected to pay for it, and they predicted that its clients would willingly pay for it once they learned first hand that the service was good.

One director of admissions commented that no agency could expect to be self-supporting from the very beginning, but he thought that if the FCES were begun with solid financial backing and its services were good, its chances of success were excellent. He recalled that the status of the Test of English as a Foreign Languag (TOEFL) was very shaky for the first three years, but that with the assistance of the College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service it managed to weather the storms and to become widely used and highly respected. He predicted that a non-governmental FCES could anticipate attaining the same measure of success, provided that it got off to a good start.

PART V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

XVIII. CONCLUSIONS

In summation it can be said that it would be feasible to establish a non-governmental Foreign Credential Evaluation Service to serve academic institutions and federal, state, and private agencies. If such a service were endorsed by the U.S. Office of Education and the associations which form the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions, it would have sufficient authority and prestige to get started. Once the FCES was in full operation, its authority and prestige would be derived from the quality, accuracy, and speed of its services.

The opinions of the responding foreign student admissions officers and agency representatives concerning the authority and prestige of a non-governmental FCES can best be summarized by quoting a federal agency representative who said: "Can this service be obtained better, cheaper, and faster from any other source? If not, we'll use the non-governmental FCES."

If the services which will be offered by a non-governmental FCES represent an improvement over those which are currently offered by the FCES of the Comparative Education Staff of the U.S. Office of Education, the non-governmental FCES is likely to receive the same or an increased volume of requests, even though a fee would be charged. There is a strong likelihood that the volume would increase, and it may even double. Once the FCES is in full operation, it would be self-supporting. For the five developmental years, however, it would need a guarantee of financial assistance from some outside source.

Most of the institutions and agencies which will use the FCES would absorb the cost in their own operating budgets. Some would pass it on to the applicant. A few would be unable to get involved in any fee procedures and would need to have the FCES bill the applicant directly. Although the idea of paying for the service is not very popular, there does not seem to be a great deal of opposition to it, as long as the speed and quality of the service are improved.

There seems to be no question concerning the need for a foreign credential evaluation service. The opinions of the responding foreign student admissions officers and agency representatives can probably best be summarized by a quote taken from a report which a graduate dean sent to his president after participating in one of the feasibility study conferences:

> A sidelight to the meeting occurred when a Spanish representative from a Junior college implied that foreign students receive unfair evaluations in many large universities and colleges. It was argued, however, that on the whole, foreign students tend to receive the benefit of the doubt and that, in many instances, certain schools accept every foreign applicant they receive regardless of quality. Personally, I felt that this sidelight summed up the true need for such an agency.

There also seems to be no question concerning the need for a firm research foundation for a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service. The responding admissions officers and agency representatives emphasized quite frequently and most firmly that if such a service failed to use every resource available in order to keep its data accurate and up-to-date, the quality of the evaluations which it produced would not warrant its existence.

The Comparative Education Staff of the U.S. Office of Education was frequently cited as a vital source of the information which a non-governmental FCES would require. The persons who furnished data for this feasibility study appeared to be in complete agreement with the recommendations made in 1964 by Education and World Affairs in its report on the international dimensions of the U.S. Office of Education. They felt that the U.S. Office of Education should strongly emphasize its function as a clearinghouse in comparative education, that it should be given the necessary authority and budgetary support to develop a comprehensive program of research in the international field, and that the information which is obtained concerning foreign institutions and educational systems should be quickly disseminated to all persons, institutions, and agencies in the United States who are working in the field of international education.

XIX. RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE STAFFING OF A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE

In order to offer an improved and speedier foreign credential evaluation service, a non-governmental FCES must be adequately staffed. For an annual volume of 17,000 to 20,000 requests per year, it would need a director, a coordinator of information and resources, five credential evaluators, and five typists.

The director would be responsible for all matters involving policy, budget, and liaison with other institutions, agencies, and organizations. He would organize seminars, workshops and briefing sessions sponsored by the FCES, and would coordinate the participation of FCES personnel in similar activities sponsored by other organizations and associations which are active in this field. The director should be someone who has had experience in directing an office which is involved with matters of both policy formation and organizational detail. He should have had some experience in evaluating foreign educational credentials at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and he should be familiar with the admissions philosophies and evaluation needs of both selective and non-selective academic institutions and federal, state, and private agencies. In the initial stages of its development a non-governmental FCES will need maximum visibility; the director will therefore need to explain its services and procedures to all potential clients. It would be advantageous for him to be already recognized by his peers as knowledgeable in the field of foreign educational credential evaluation.

The coordinator of information and resources would be responsible for all matters involving procedures and the daily operations of the FCES. He would have responsibility for the management of the budget, the collection and organization of data, the flow and management of information, the maintenance of office records, and the supervision of the evaluation staff. The coordinator should have had some experience in evaluating foreign educational credentials and in supervising a

professional or semi-professional staff. It would be highly desirable for him to also be familiar with systems development and with computerized data collection and retrieval.

The credential evaluators should have a bachelor's degree or the equivalent, including basic training in at least one foreign language. If they have not already done so, they should be interested in acquiring at least a minimal reading knowledge of the major European languages. The evaluators would be responsible for acquiring and maintaining a complete library of resource materials and for maintaining contact with knowledgeable persons in the fields of comparative education and foreign credentials evaluation. They would respond to all requests for credential evaluations and related information, and would search out the necessary information if it were not already available in their files. It would be advantageous for the credential evaluators to have had at least one year's experience evaluating foreign educational credentials at an institution or agency which has a fairly large volume of foreign applicants.

For receptionist, clerical, typing and filing duties, the FCES would need at least five secretary-typists.

In addition to its professional and clerical staff, a non-governmental FCES might have two advisory boards, one concerned with budgetary and policy matters and one concerned with operation and procedures. The policy advisory board might be composed of representatives from other organizations which are involved in this field, such as AACRAO, CEEB, COS, IIE, NAFSA, and the Comparative Research Staff of the U.S. Office of Education, plus representatives from at least one institution and one agency which use the FCES. Both the director and the coordinator should be ex officio members of this board.

The operational advisory board might include knowledgeable foreign student admissions officers and agency representatives. The director, the coordinator, and all of the evaluators should be ex officio members of this board. It might also be advisable for one or two members of each board to represent it on the other.

Ideally a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service should try to provide as many of the services which are needed by its users as it is possible to provide. To offer a wide spectrum of services would not be feasible during the developmental stages, however. It would most probably be necessary to restrict the service which is offered to those seven categories of information which are listed in XVI above (pages 45-48). Additional services, such as those which are mentioned on pages 48-50, might be offered later, after the service has been well established.

Since the efficiency of the FCES and the quality of its service will depend to a great extent upon the administrative operation of the office and the evaluation forms and procedures which are used, the staff will need to spend a great deal of time initially determining which ones will prove to be most beneficial. The operational advisory board might be of assistance in this regard. Special attention might be given to the evaluation forms and procedures which have been developed by the other agencies which are currently working in this field, such as the FCES of the U.S. Office of Education, the AACRAO/AID contract team, the Midwest Evaluation Project, and the Office of Foreign Student and Faculty Programs of the State University of New York (Albany). Some of these might be easily converted for use by the FCES.

XV. RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING FEES AND BILLING ARRANGEMENTS

The fees which a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service might charge for its services should be large enough to meet its expenses and small enough to attract a large volume of use. Perhaps the policy advisory board could assist the FCES staff in estimating its total annual expenses and the total volume of use, so that the fees could be set accordingly.

There will be a need for several different categories of fees. Academic institutions which have fairly large foreign student enrollments and experienced foreign

student admissions personnel will be more interested in information concerning foreign institutions and answers to specific questions than in the evaluation of individual sets of educational credentials. The foreign student admissions officer of one large university stated that his institution would gladly pay a membership fee of $500 per year for the privilege of asking specific questions and receiving a FCES newsletter and other written reports. For this type of institution an annual membership fee based upon its foreign student enrollment might be appropriate.

Academic institutions with fairly small foreign student enrollments will be more interested in an evaluation of specific foreign educational credentials than in detailed information and research reports. For this type of institution a standard fee per set of credentials submitted for evaluation might be appropriate.

Academic institutions which have experienced foreign student admissions personnel but relatively small foreign student enrollments may wish to receive both written reports and answers to specific questions and evaluations of foreign educational credentials. For this type of institution a combination fee arrangement might be appropriate.

The federal agencies in general will prefer to negotiate an annual contract, perhaps based upon the volume of evaluations which they requested during the preceding year. Some state agencies will prefer to make arrangements similar to those developed for academic institutions and federal agencies, others will be able to use the services of the FCES only if the fee can be billed directly to the applicant. The private agencies will most probably be able to follow one of the fee arrangements devised to meet the needs of the other users.

The policy advisory board might assist the staff of the FCES in determining the number and variety of fee arrangements which the FCES can afford to offer (especially from a record-keeping point of view). Care should be taken to make sure that the various fee arrangements will result in a fair and equitable charge to all users of the FCES.

XXI. AN ESTIMATE OF THE BUDGET WHICH WOULD BE REQUIRED BY A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE

For a staff of twelve, a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service would need a budget of approximately $133,400 - $202,400 for salaries and $48,500 - $60,000 for operating expenses, excluding capital equipment. (The current salary budget of the Comparative Education Staff of the U.S. Office of Education is approximately $163,500 - $214,400 per year). The following is an approximation of what the annual budget might be:

Salaries	Minimum	Maximum
Director	$18,000	$24,000
Coordinator	15,000	20,000
Five evaluators(@ $10,000 - $16,000)	50,000	80,000
Five typists (@ $5,000 - $8,000)	25,000	40,000
Temporary & part-time staff (3200 - 4800 hours @ $2.50 per hour)	8,000	12,000
Fringe benefits @ 15%	17,400	26,400
TOTAL SALARIES	$133,400	$202,400

Operating Expenses	Minimum	Maximum
Office rental (3000 sq. ft. @ $6 - $7)	$18,000	$21,000
Electricity ($100-$150 per month)	1,200	1,800
Telephone ($900-$1000 per month)	10,800	12,000
Supplies, dues, publications ($300 - $400 per month)	3,600	4,800
Postage (15¢ each for 17,000 - 20,000 evaluations)	2,550	3,000
Printing (of evaluation forms & other materials)	2,350	3,400
Travel	5,000	7,000
Meetings sponsored by the FCES (5-7 @$1000)	5,000	7,000
TOTAL OFFICE RENTAL + OPERATION	$48,500	$60,000
TOTAL ESTIMATED BUDGET	$181,900	$262,400

A non-governmental FCES would need approximately five years to achieve full operation. Ideally, part of the income which it receives during this time should be reserved in an escrow account to provide sufficient funds for at least two future years' expenses, so that adequate budgetary planning for future years can be done in advance. The FCES would therefore need to receive a guarantee of partial financial assistance from some outside source in order to meet its operating expenses for this developmental period.

XXII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A FIVE-YEAR DEVELOPMENTAL BUDGET FOR A NON-GOVERNMENTAL FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICE

It would take approximately six months for a non-governmental foreign credential evaluation service to be organized. This would involve hiring a director, finding a suitable office location, assembling a staff, accumulating the necessary resource and reference materials, and developing adequate administrative, record keeping, and billing procedures. During this period the FCES would provide no services and, consequently, receive no income.

During the next six months of operation, the FCES could be expected to receive approximately 5000 requests for the evaluation of foreign academic credentials. This might reasonably be expanded to 10,000 requests per year by the end of the second year of operation, to 20,000 by the end of the third year, to 25,000 by the end of the fourth year, and to 30,000 by the end of the fifth year.

For an annual budget of approximately $181,900 and a volume of evaluation requests of approximately 17,000, a non-governmental FCES would need to charge about $10.70 per set of records evaluated in order to balance income with expenditures. (These figures are an estimate of the probable budget and volume if a non-governmental FCES were in full operation right now, if it had the minimum budget of $181,900 which is outlined in XXI above, and if it were handling a volume of 17,000 evaluation requests, such as is currently being received by the FCES of the

U.S. Office of Education). Since there could be additional income from related sources (such as a membership fee and/or a subscription rate to cover requests for general information and information concerning particular foreign academic institutions, and a possible monthly newsletter), it might be possible for the rate charged per set of records to be somewhat lower than $10.70.

During the five-year developmental period, a non-governmental FCES might be expected to have the following income and expenditures (presuming the increasing volume of requests noted above, a rate of $10.70 per set of credentials evaluated, the minimum annual budget outlined in XXI above, and an annual increase in overhead of 10%):

Year	Eval. Requests	Income	Budget	Deficit or Surplus	Guarantee Needed For Deficit	Guarantee Needed For Escrow
First	5,000	$53,500	$181,900	-$128,400	$128,400	$ 71,600
Second	10,000	107,000	200,100	-93,090	93,090	81,910
Third	20,000	214,000	220,100	-6,100	6,100	133,900
Fourth	25,000	267,500	242,100	+25,400	---	125,000
Fifth	30,000	321,000	266,310	+54,690	---	125,000
TOTALS		$963,000	$1,110,500	-$147,500	$227,590	$537,410

In order to meet the anticipated budget deficits of the first three years and to accumulate a total of $615,176 in escrow to cover budgets for two future years, it would be necessary for approximately $765,000 to be guaranteed from some outside source. This amount might be subdivided into $200,000, $175,000, $150,000, $125,000, and $125,000 for each of the five developmental years, respectively (as noted above in the "Guarantee Needed" columns). If the volume of evaluation requests received should increase more rapidly than is estimated above, the increased income so produced would result in a reduction in the escrow guarantee which would be needed.

This developmental budget does not include a special item to cover the cost of consultant fees, although it is acknowledged that consultants will be needed for the development of adequate management, data processing, credential evaluation, and billing procedures. However, it is anticipated that the gradual increase in the volume of requests received will result in reduced expenses during the first year or two (e.g., it may not be necessary to hire all of the evaluators and typists immediately, and the cost of postage will be lower). The amount of money saved on these items might be used for consultants' fees.

In addition to the budget items noted above, a non-governmental FCES will need to purchase capital equipment. Although most of the equipment will need to be purchased during the first six months, it may be possible to defer purchase of some (e.g. desks, chairs) until full staffing is attained.

APPENDIX A: TOTAL NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES CONTACTED, BY STATE

STATE	FOR A CONFERENCE		VIA THE QUESTIONNAIRE		TOTAL
	INSTITUTIONS	AGENCIES	INSTITUTIONS	AGENCIES	
Alabama	0	0	5	0	5
Arizona	0	0	4	2	6
Arkansas	0	0	3	0	3
California	74	1	0	2	77
Colorado	0	0	4	2	6
Connecticut	0	0	6	2	8
Delaware	0	0	1	0	1
District of Columbia	31	4	0	0	35
Florida	27	0	0	2	29
Georgia	50	0	0	1	51
Idaho	0	0	3	0	3
Illinois	5	0	17	2	24
Indiana	0	0	9	2	11
Iowa	0	0	3	0	3
Kansas	20	0	0	1	21
Kentucky	0	0	6	1	7
Louisiana	0	0	4	1	5
Maine	0	0	3	0	3
Maryland	13	0	0	2	15
Massachusetts	47	0	0	2	49
Michigan	31	0	0	2	33
Minnesota	0	0	12	2	14
Mississippi	0	0	2	0	2
Missouri	25	0	0	1	26

(Appendix A continued on page 64)

APPENDIX A (Continued)

STATE	FOR A CONFERENCE INSTITUTIONS	FOR A CONFERENCE AGENCIES	VIA THE QUESTIONNAIRE INSTITUTIONS	VIA THE QUESTIONNAIRE AGENCIES	TOTAL
Montana	0	0	2	0	2
Nebraska	0	0	5	0	5
Nevada	0	0	2	0	2
New Hampshire	0	0	3	0	3
New Jersey	0	0	8	2	10
New Mexico	0	0	3	0	3
New York	41	0	10	2	53
North Carolina	0	0	5	1	6
North Dakota	0	0	3	0	3
Ohio	2	0	10	2	14
Oklahoma	0	0	4	0	4
Oregon	6	0	2	0	8
Pennsylvania	0	0	15	2	17
Rhode Island	0	0	4	1	5
South Carolina	0	0	2	0	2
South Dakota	0	0	3	0	3
Tennessee	0	0	6	0	6
Texas	0	0	9	1	10
Utah	0	0	4	0	4
Vermont	0	0	3	0	3
Virginia	13	0	0	1	14
Washington	26	0	0	0	26
Wisconsin	9	1	13	2	25
TOTALS	420	6	198	41	665

No institutions or agencies were contacted in Alaska, Hawaii, West Virginia or Wyoming.

APPENDIX B: RESPONSES RECEIVED, BY STATE

STATE	IN CONFERENCE INSTITUTIONS	IN CONFERENCE AGENCIES	VIA QUESTIONNAIRE INSTITUTIONS	VIA QUESTIONNAIRE AGENCIES	TOTAL RESPONSES	TOTAL CONTACTED
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	5
Arizona	0	0	1	2	3	6
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0	3
California	18	1	0	2	21	77
Colorado	0	0	1	2	3	6
Connecticut	0	0	2	2	4	8
Delaware	0	0	1	0	1	1
District of Columbia	5	3	0	0	8	35
Florida	7	0	0	1	8	29
Georgia	9	0	0	0	9	51
Idaho	0	0	2	0	2	3
Illinois	3	0	9	2	14	24
Indiana	0	0	5	1	6	11
Iowa	0	0	2	0	2	3
Kansas	6	0	0	1	7	21
Kentucky	0	0	4	1	5	7
Louisiana	0	0	2	1	3	5
Maine	0	0	3	0	3	3
Maryland	4	0	0	2	6	15
Massachusetts	15	0	0	1	16	49
Michigan	14	0	0	2	16	33
Minnesota	0	0	8	1	9	14
Mississippi	0	0	1	0	1	2
Missouri	8	0	0	1	9	26

(Appendix B continued on page 66.)

APPENDIX B (Continued)

STATE	IN CONFERENCE INSTITUTIONS	IN CONFERENCE AGENCIES	VIA QUESTIONNAIRE INSTITUTIONS	VIA QUESTIONNAIRE AGENCIES	TOTAL RESPONSES	TOTAL CONTACTED
Montana	0	0	1	0	1	2
Nebraska	0	0	1	0	1	5
Nevada	0	0	1	0	1	2
New Hampshire	0	0	1	0	1	3
New Jersey	0	0	3	1	4	10
New Mexico	0	0	2	0	2	3
New York	13	0	5	1	19	53
North Carolina	0	0	2	1	3	6
North Dakota	0	0	2	0	2	3
Ohio	2	0	7	2	11	14
Oklahoma	0	0	4	0	4	4
Oregon	0	0	[illegible]	0	2	8
Pennsylvania	0	0	8	2	10	17
Rhode Island	0	0	2	1	3	5
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	2
South Dakota	0	0	1	0	1	3
Tennessee	0	0	3	0	3	6
Texas	0	0	5	1	6	10
Utah	0	0	2	0	2	4
Vermont	0	0	2	0	2	3
Virginia	1	0	0	0	1	14
Washington	9	0	0	0	9	26
Wisconsin	6	1	8	2	17	25
TOTALS	120	5	103	33	261	665